

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-10 and 12-16 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 12 being independent. Claim 12 is amended. Claim 11 is canceled. These changes are believed to add no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

At the outset, inventor Robert Jensen and Applicant's representative, Albert J. Fasulo, II, thank Examiner T. Gesesse for the courtesy of a telephonic interview held 9/21/06. During the interview, Applicant explained technical differences between the invention recited in claim 1 and the applied reference authored by R. Jensen et al.

Applicant explained that in steps (a) and (b) of claim 1, the local station receiver, e.g., in a spacecraft (see claim 16), is *not* locked to an uplink signal and, therefore, operates at its Best Lock Frequency (BLF). See present application paragraphs [0003] and [0029] regarding the BLF. While the local station (e.g., spacecraft) receiver is *unlocked*, information indicating the BLF is derived in the local station (e.g., spacecraft), and then, in step (c), the information is telemetered to the remote station (e.g., ground station), where the BLF is estimated. The remote station (e.g., ground station) transmits an uplink signal that will be received at the local station (e.g., spacecraft) at the estimated BLF, which facilitates a relatively quick tracking acquisition of the uplink signal in the local station.

In contrast, the Jensen article describes a system/method wherein the receiver in the local station (e.g., satellite) is *locked* to an uplink signal. See Jensen, pg. 964, first column, 3rd full paragraph, where it states “[a]s the spacecraft travels over the ground station, its on-board receiver *phase-locks* to the uplink signal” While *locked*, the satellite derives and then telemeters to the ground information indicating a comparison between the received uplink frequency and a satellite reference frequency. Thus, the Jensen article neither discloses nor suggests the method recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, it is believed claim 1, and all of the claims depending from claim 1, are patentable.

New Title

The existing title is replaced by a new title consistent with the preamble of claim 1 and, e.g., the title block of method 400 depicted in FIG. 4.

Specification Amendment

In the specification, a new heading and paragraph [0001.1] have been added after paragraph [0001] to provide a Statement of Governmental Interest.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in original claims 6 – 9 and 12 - 15.

Claim 6-9 depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

Claim 12 is rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitation of intervening and base claim 11, and therefore should be allowable.

Claims depending from claim 12 are allowable for the same reasons claim 12 is allowable.

Conclusion

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application is believed warranted. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 443-778-5639.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
Applied Physics Laboratory

By Albert J. Fasulo
Albert J. Fasulo, II
Reg. No. 43,607
Tel.: (240) 228-5639

Date 9/22/06

AJF/kaa